

Hence, any device receiving the HTTP response is able to present not only the first content object, but also is able to *prefetch* the second content object based on receipt of the content operation identifier. Consequently, any device that receives the HTTP response can prefetch the second content object for acceleration of web content for a user.

Independent claims 1 and 20 further specify that the second content object is "determined as relevant to the first content object by a *predictive caching operation*." As described in the specification, the prefetching of "relevant" content enables the acceleration of web content that has not yet been requested by a user.

These and other features are neither disclosed nor suggested in the applied prior art.

Fishman et al provides no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever of sending an HTTP response that includes *both* the first content object *and* the content operation identifier, as claimed. Rather, Fishman et al describes a mobile gateway (e.g., 250/350 with respect to Figures 2 and 3A-3E) configured for caching content (e.g., data object 232/332) that is received from the content server 210/310.

Fishman et al stresses that content 232/332 received by the mobile gateway 250/350 and stored in the cache 280 is customized for one or more mobile clients (e.g., 274, 276, 278, 279 of Figure 2): the content 232/332 stored in the cache 280/380 is customized for the mobile clients based on applying respective content transforms (e.g., 254, 256, 258, 259 of Figure 2) (column 3, lines 35-43), where the mobile client data 252/352 identifies the corresponding association between a mobile client and the corresponding transform (see, e.g., column 8, lines 52-53 and column 8, line 65 to column 9, lines 10).

Hence, the mobile gateway 250/350 responds to receiving content 232/332 from the content server 210/310 on behalf of a mobile client (e.g., 274/374) by identifying the appropriate transform (e.g., 254/354) from the mobile client data 252/352, transforming the content 232/332 into transformed content, and sending the transformed content to the mobile client; as illustrated in Fig. 3C, the mobile gateway 250/350 also caches into the cache 380 the content 332 received from the content server 310 in the cache 380 as cached content 382, and caches the transformed content 384

for the device 374 (see column 3, lines 47-54, column 9, lines 10-29, column 12, lines 41-49, and column 13, lines 12-35).

Requests for the content 332 from similar type devices enable the mobile gateway 250/350 to transmit the cached transformed content 384 (e.g., column 9, lines 19-23,); if the transformed content for a given device is not locally stored in the cache 380, the gateway 250/350 applies the appropriate transform to the locally cached data object 382 (e.g., column 12, line 60 to column 13, line 12). Hence, Fishman et al teaches caching a data object, creating distinct transforms of the data object for respective device types, and caching the multiple distinct transforms.

Fishman et al., however, provides no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever of sending to a device *an HTTP response that includes the first content object and the content operation identifier*, where the content operation identifier includes *a directive* for the device to *prefetch* a second content object as a content operation distinct from presentation of the first content object.

In fact, Fishman et al provides no reference whatsoever to prefetching any content at all. Rather, Fishman et al simply describes caching received data, and relies on a conventional request-based system where no data is retrieved until specifically selected by a user device (see, e.g., column 11, lines 40-41 ("content server 210 simply provides content in the usual manner"); column 12, lines 15-20, especially lines 19-20 ("selecting the URL causes phone 374 to make the request"). Consequently, Fishman et al teaches that the content server 210/310 only outputs the data object 232/332 to the mobile gateway 250/350, and that the mobile gateway 250/350 only outputs the appropriate transformed data object (e.g., 384) to the corresponding mobile client.

Hence, Fishman et al neither discloses nor suggests outputting to a device an HTTP response that includes the first content object *and* the content operation identifier, where the content operation identifier enables the device to perform the prefetching of the second content object, as claimed.

For these and other reasons, the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

It is believed the dependent claims 3-5, 8-10, 15-17, 22-24, 27-29, and 34-36 are allowable in view of their dependency from the respective independent claims.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-472, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. R. Turkevich', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: November 21, 2005